UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,847	03/03/2004	Youenn Fablet	01807.101570.	2498

5514   7590   07/08/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
ZAER, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 April 2009</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is the final rejection for application 10/790847. Claims 1-24 are pending int
this application.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant argues, "Thus, in Lonnroth, the XML request document is dependent
on the request and on the user sending the request (see, column 5, lines 37 to 44:
"specifically, the pre-processor 240 searches configuration database 254 to determine
how to construct the XML document ... based on the phone number and the user id.") In
contrast, in the invention, the service description document is the same for any client
and is independent of any client or user characteristics. Therefore, Lonnroth is not seen
to teach the features of Claims 1 and 16".

    The example cited in column 5 is merely one embodiment of the disclosure in
Lonnroth.   Lonnroth states that the pre-processor will dictate the form in which the
requests must be received (Col 5, ln 5-15). This indicates that there is a standard form
of the document.

    Lonnroth also constructs documents for various services. While the services
included in the document might vary, that is based on what services are authorized to
each client, the actual format of the document itself is independent of the client and the
services are the same across all clients (Col 5, ln 55-67).

    Finally, Lonnroth discloses arbitrary client application that work on any type of
client. These are independent of any client characteristics. They have an advantage in

that the developer need not create different versions of the application (Lonnroth, col 10, ln 50-60). Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

3.   Applicant also argues, "In Lonroth, the generation of a message is required. However, in the present invention, the client can test access to the service without generating the message. Thus, Lonroth is not seen to teach the foregoing features of Claims 13 and 17".

        Lonnroth discloses that such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30). The argued limitation is not claimed by the applicant. Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

4.   Applicant also argues, "In Lonnroth, only the service can validate the document because the service uses some user or client information to perform security checks (authorization, identification, etc.). However, in the invention, there is no need for the validation to have such knowledge of the client. This enables the ability to make the validation and the service totally independent, which is not true in Lonnroth. Thus, Lonroth is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 14 and 18".

        The example cited in column 5 is merely one embodiment of the disclosure in Lonnroth. Lonnroth states that the pre-processor will dictate the form in which the requests must be received (Col 5, ln 5-15). This indicates that there is a standard form of the document.

Lonnroth discloses arbitrary client application that work on any type of client.

These are independent of any client characteristics. They have an advantage in that

the developer need not create different versions of the application (Lonnroth, col 10, ln

50-60). Therefore, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-12, 14-16, 18-19, 21-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Lonnroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonnroth).

Regarding Claim 1, Lonnroth discloses a "method of offering a service provided

by a server computer in a communication network". Specifically, Lonroth discloses a

method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be serviced by a single application

is described (Lonnroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

Lonnroth also discloses "comprising sending, from a server computer that
provides a service to a client computer, a service description document, which is
independent of any client or user characteristic, defining the type of data exchanged
between said server and any client when said service is executed". Specifically, the
XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is
referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes
links that identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As
shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include
metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of
post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Lonnroth also discloses "the document comprising a description of a processing
functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML
format of a message exchanged during the execution of said service on the
communication network". Specifically, As shall be described in greater detail
hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor
240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln
30-52)

Regarding Claim 2, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 1, wherein
said processing functionality defines processings adapted to produce or use data in
XML format defined in a first abstract part of a service description document".

Specifically, those request objects take the form of XML documents (Lonnroth, col 4 , ln 10-15).

Regarding Claim 3, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 2, wherein the description of said processing functionality is inserted in said first abstract part of the service description document". Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

Regarding Claim 4, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 1, wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script language". Specifically, post processor has an XSL engine (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 5, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 1, wherein said processing functionality is defined as a data item in XML format in a first abstract part of a service description document". Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

   Regarding Claim 6, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 5, wherein said data item in XML format defining said processing functionality is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document". Specifically, the metadata may contain data that identifies the particular client that issued a request, the device type of the client, the protocol supported by that client, the user currently using the client, the service requested by the client, and various parameters associated with the requested service (Lonnroth, col 9, ln 32-37).

   Regarding Claim 7, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 1, wherein the description of said processing functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said processing functionality, said properties defining at least respectively"(Lonnroth, col 8, ln 21-37). Furthermore, Lonnroth also discloses the style sheet for each device includes general instructions about how data should be formatted for he device (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 39-52).

   Lonnroth discloses a "the node in the communication network adapted to execute said processing". Specifically discloses a pre-processor and post- processor (col 4, ln 6-10).

   Lonnroth discloses a "the type of processing". Specifically discloses XML processing (col 6, ln 1-10).

Regarding Claim 8, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify whether said processing is carried out on the sending or reception of said message". Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 9, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the message or a set of messages to which said processing applies". Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 10, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 7, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the data produced or used by said processing, and possibly the type of said data". Specifically, XSL style sheets contain instructions about how each type of data item that can be contained in an XML document should be formatted prior to transmission to the client (Lonnroth, col 8, ln 20-25).

Regarding Claim 11, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 7, wherein the description of said processing functionality comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is obligatory or optional". Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Regarding Claim 12, Lonnroth discloses a "method according to Claim 7, wherein, for at least one property supported by said processing functionality, the description of said processing functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said property". Specifically, in one embodiment, information about which services are authorized for each client are stored in a configuration database (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 28-30).

Regarding Claim 14, Lonnroth discloses a "method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a reprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network". Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth discloses "acquiring the message at the intermediate computer". In

response to an XML request document to determine the status of a user's packages,

XML processor 242 makes calls to gateway 234 (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 25-45).

Lonnroth discloses "extracting from the service description document, the

description of a service associated with the document". Gateway 234 converts those

requests into HTTP messages that request the required information from the

appropriate sites on the World Wide Web(Lonnroth, col 6, ln 25-45).

Lonnroth also discloses "extracting a processing from the message received".

Specifically, the pre-processor generates based on the request and information

contained in configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document

(Lonnroth, col 5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses "acquiring from said service description document at

least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing". Specifically,

the pre-processor generates based on the request and information contained in

configuration database, a request object in the form of an XML document (Lonnroth, col

5, ln 31-35).

Lonnroth also discloses "verifying whether said imperative value is included in a

list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by said processing

functionality described in the service description document". Specifically, the XML

document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a service request is referred

to herein as a XML request document. The XML request document includes links that

identify the information sources that correspond to the requested service. As shall be

described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Regarding Claim 15, Lonnroth also discloses "reading the value associated with a property adapted to specify whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of said message". Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses "executing said processing when said value is adapted to specify that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message". Specifically, the post-processor receives XML responses from the XML processor and a filtering unit selectively filters XL response documents based on filtering rules (Lonnroth, col 7, ln 40-50).

Regarding Claim 16, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 18, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 14. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Regarding Claim 19, Lonnroth also discloses "server computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1" (Lonnroth, Fig 2: node 110, col 5, ln 18).

Regarding Claim 21, Lonnroth also discloses a "computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14" (Lonnroth, Fig 3, col 11, ln 7-8).

Regarding Claim 22, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of offering a service according to Claim 1". This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 24, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14". This claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 13,17,20,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lonnroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonnroth).

        Regarding Claim 13, Lonnroth discloses a "method of testing access to a

service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description

document, comprising the following steps implemented by said client computer".

Specifically, Lonroth discloses a method and system for allowing an arbitrary client to be

serviced by a single application is described (Lonnroth, col 3, ln 49-51).

        Lonnroth also discloses a "extracting from said service description, provided by a

server computer offering a said service, document a description of a processing

functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML

format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the

communication network". Specifically, XML gateways are mechanisms for converting

between XML and messages produced by other types of data sources (Lonnroth, col 6,

ln 8-10).

        Lonnroth also discloses "reading, from the extracted description of said

processing functionality, a value associated with a property adapted to specify a node in

the communication network adapted to execute the processing". Specifically, the XML

gateways that are called by XML processor in response to a particular XML request

document are XML gateways that are connected to the data sources have the information identified in the XML request document (Lonnroth, col 6, ln 26-35).

Lonnroth also discloses a "reading, from the extracted description of said processing functionality, a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional". Specifically, upon receiving a service request, the pre-processor performs any operations that are required prior to servicing the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 22-25).

Lonnroth also discloses a "verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be executed by said client computer in the communication network". Specifically, such operations may include, for example, performing security checks to determine whether the client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Lonnroth does not specifically, disclose implementing all the steps above on the client device. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the steps on the client device. The motivation to do so is that Lonnroth states the set of services that may be requested by one client may be different then service requested by another client (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 58-60). It would be obvious to verify the services at the client level to allow the client to only use the service that it requested and not another client requested.

Regarding Claim 17, applicant claims a device with the means for performing the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 20, Lonnroth also discloses a "client computer in a communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13" (Lonnroth, col 4, ln 30).

Regarding Claim 23, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13". This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHRAF ZAHR whose telephone number is (571)270-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ 7/4/09
/Ting Zhou/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173